

-4-

Regarding claims 11 and 23, there is no mention in Shively of adjusting the schedule based on average load between inputs and outputs. The examiner states that "there must be a controller." However, since Shively does not disclose such a controller, it does not anticipate these claims. Moreover, in a circuit switch, such as Shively's system, there is no need to adapt to input traffic. The circuits are set up by a separate control mechanism. Thus, at any point in time the schedule is appropriate for the circuits routed through the switch. In contrast, in a packet switch, such as the present invention, the load changes dynamically as input packets arrive.

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is believed that all claims are in condition for allowance, and it is respectfully requested that the application be passed to issue. If the Examiner feels that a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

HAMILTON, BROOK, SMITH & REYNOLDS, P.C.

By



Todd A. Gerety

Registration No. 51,729

Telephone: (978) 341-0036

Facsimile: (978) 341-0136

Concord, MA 01742-9133

Dated: 3/23/04